

## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 11, 17 – 22 and 24 – 41 were pending in the application. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 8, 9, 11, 21, 24, 25, 36 and 39, and cancelled claims 1 – 7, 10, 17 – 20, 22 – 23, 31, 38 and 41. Applicants have added new claims 42 – 50. Accordingly, claims 8, 9, 11, 21, 24, 25 – 30, 32 – 37, 39 – 40 and 42 – 50 are pending.

### Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6, 10, 17, 18, 22, 25-30, 36, 37 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over OMG (Interface Repository OMG TC Document 94-11-7) in view of Nelson et al (US Pat. 5,577,252). The Office Action rejected claims 7, 19, 20, 31, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over OMG (Interface Repository OMG TC Document 94-11-7) in view of Nelson et al (US Pat. 5,577,252), and in further view of SOM (SOMobjects Developer Toolkit Users Guide, version 2.0, pages 7-1 to 7-16). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 25, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that C:\myfiles\ represents a specified prefix name, and that newcls.ir represents an interface declaration. SOM teaches an Interface Repository emitter that may be used to create or update an Interface Repository file. The Interface Repository emitter uses an environment variable to designate a file name for the interface repository. For example, an **Interface Repository file** named newcls.ir may be created within the C:\myfiles\ **directory**. (SOM, 7-2) Applicants can therefore find no teaching or suggestion in OMG, Nelson, or SOM of "an interface repository loader that accepts as input parameters a specified interface definition language file containing at least one interface definition language declaration, and *a specified prefix name, and installs the at least one interface definition language declaration in a prefix naming context having the prefix naming*

*context in the interface repository*". Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 25 is not supported by the cited art.

The rejection of independent claim 36 is improper for reasons similar to those advanced above in regard to claim 25.

Applicant has further added new claims 42-50. Applicant can find no description in OMG or Nelson which teaches or suggests, either separately or in combination, that the one or more interface definitions include an IDL root context, but the prefix naming context acts as the root IDL naming context. In contrast, Nelson teaches a context object D which contains bindings for objects named A, B, and C. The object named C in turn contains bindings for objects named I, J and K. (col. 6, lines 23 – 31). In Nelson, the defined root context "D" also serves as the root naming context.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Office Action indicated that claims 8, 9, 11, 21 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the respective base claims and any intervening claims. These claims have been rewritten as such. Thus, Applicants assert that claims 8, 9, 11, 21 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

**Allowed Claims:**

Claims 32-35 and 40 are allowed.



RECEIVED

MAR 05 2004

Technology Center 2100

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-82301/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$  
for fees (      ).
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Kowert  
Reg. No. 39,255  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: February 27, 2004